

REMARKS

Amendments to the specification have been made to correct minor typographical and grammatical errors.

Claims 11 and 12 are indicated by the Office as allowed. Claim 12 has
5 been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 11 and 12.

Claims 1, 13 and 21 have been cancelled herein without prejudice.

Claims 2-10, 14-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 2-10, 14-20 and 22-28 remain in this application.

10

Examiner Interview

A telephone interview was conducted on May 25, 2004 between Examiner Douglas Tran and Emmanuel Rivera. It was pointed out that independent claim 11 has been found to be allowable. The Office states in the
15 present office action that “[a]s to claim 11, the prior art, taken singly or in combination, does not teach ‘operatively preparing a job further includes identifying if the current configuration status will prevent the job from being completed based on at least one of the desired print media requirements, and if so alerting the user that the printer needs manual intervention to complete the
20 print job’.”

It was discussed that independent claims 2, 14, and 22 may be amended to include the above elements to overcome the prior art.

It was discussed that independent claim 7 has been rejected as unpatentable over a combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,133,048 to Parsons et al
25 and U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411 to McCormick et al. The Office relies on Parsons as disclosing or suggesting the element of claim 7 of “selectively configuring the print media supply tray further includes at least once, initially,

installing print driver software on at least one computer coupled to the printer,
wherein, during print driver software installation a user is prompted, using a
graphical user interface, to configure the print driver software to match the
configuration of the print media supply tray based at least on the print media
5 size, the print media type, and at least one print media supply tray identifier.”

However, the Office does not point out where in Parsons this particular
element is disclosed or suggested, but takes official notice that this is well
known in the art.

10 **35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2-6, 14-20, and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as
being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,133,048 to
Parsons et al (Parsons); U.S. Patent No. 5,706,411 to McCormick et al
(McCormick); and U.S. Patent No. 5,305,020 to Gibbons et al (Gibbons).

15 **Amended independent claim 2** for example recites “[a] method for use
with a printer, the method comprising:

selectively configuring at least one print media supply tray based
at least on a print media size and a print media type;

automatically displaying current configuration status information
20 about the print media supply tray, including at least the print media size,
when the print media supply tray is operatively modified with regard to
at least the print media size;

wherein selectively configuring the print media supply tray
further includes causing at least a print media size detectable mechanism
25 to be modified in a manner that corresponds to the print media size, and
causing at least a print media type detectable mechanism to be modified
in a manner that corresponds to the print media type;

operatively preparing a print job request having data to be printed and identifying at least one desirable print media requirement; and

identifying if the current configuration status will prevent the print job from being completed based on at least one of the desired print media requirements, and, if so, alerting a user that the printer needs manual intervention to complete processing of the print job.

Claim 2 particularly includes the elements "operatively preparing a print job request having data to be printed and identifying at least one desirable print media requirement; and identifying if the current configuration status will prevent the print job from being completed based on at least one of the desired print media requirements, and, if so, alerting a user that the printer needs manual intervention to complete processing of the print job." As discussed during the telephone interview, and stated by the Office in the present office action such elements are not taught singly or in combination by the prior art.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 3-6 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 2. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 3-6 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Parsons, McCormick and Gibbons as applied to claim 10 and further view of U.S. Patent 6,480,209 to Jin (Jin).

Jin is cited as to teaching that a print media output tray as being selected to the print job request; however, since Parsons, McCormick and Gibbons fail to teach or suggest the elements as discussed above which are included in claim 2 and claim 10 (claim 10 depending on claim 2), it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Jin with the combination of Parsons,

McCormick and Gibbons. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 14 recites the elements “wherein the controller of the printer operatively prepares a print job request having data to be printed and identifying at least one desirable print media requirement; and identifies if the current configuration status will prevent the print job from being completed based on at least one of the desired print media requirements, and, if so, alerting a user that the printer needs manual intervention to complete processing of the print job”. As discussed during the telephone interview, and stated by the Office in the present office action such elements are not taught singly or in combination by the prior art.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 15-20 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 14. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 15-20 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 22 recites the elements “wherein the at least one controller operatively prepares a print job request having data to be printed and identifying at least one desirable print media requirement; and identifies if the current configuration status will prevent the print job from being completed based on at least one of the desired print media requirements, and, if so, alerting a user that the printer needs manual intervention to complete processing of the print job”. As discussed during the telephone interview, and stated by the Office in the present office action such elements are not taught singly or in combination by the prior art.

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 22 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 23-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 22. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 23-28 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable
5 over the combination of Parsons and McCormick. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 7 particularly recites “selectively configuring at least one print media supply tray based at least on a print media size and a print media type ... wherein selectively configuring the print media supply tray
10 further includes at least once, initially, installing print driver software on at least one computer coupled to the printer, wherein, during print driver software installation a user is prompted, using a graphical user interface, to configure the print driver software to match the configuration of the print media supply tray based at least on the print media size, the print media type, and at least one
15 print media supply tray identifier”.

Parsons teaches a display screen that includes various icons that are representative of “paper stocks” (see Fig. 10, col. 6, lines 47-52 of Parsons). “Paper stocks” describe stock selection of “size, type and color” (see col. 6, lines 22-24 of Parsons). A user chooses a particular stock from which a print
20 job is to be performed (see col. 6, lines 18-22). Parsons does not teach or suggest that when a user configures a particular paper tray by identifying particular stock identifiers, that a printer driver is installed on a computer coupled to the printer.

Claim 7 particularly recites that “selectively configuring the print media
25 supply tray further includes at least once, initially, installing print driver software on at least one computer coupled to the printer”.

The Examiner states that this element is well known in the art; however, Parsons fails to suggest or teach that "selectively configuring the print media supply tray ... includes ... installing print driver software on ... one computer coupled to the printer". The Examiner relies on official notice that this is
5 noticed fact well known in the art. Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertion of official notice. The Examiner is requested to provide documentary evidence in any subsequent office action if such rejection is maintained. See 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2).

Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 7 be
10 withdrawn.

Dependent claims 8-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on base claim 7. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 8-9 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 2-10, 14-20 and 22-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance
5 of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

10

Dated: 6/15/07By: 

Emmanuel A. Rivera
Reg. No. 45,760
(509) 324-9256 ext. 245

15